REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 38-55 and 57-68 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 56 is canceled, and claims 1 and 38 are amended to more particularly point out their claimed invention. Claim 1 is amended for clarity, and the amendment of claim 1 is not intended to narrow the claim. In particular, Applicants have amended the claim to clarify that the operably distinct collectors are along independent flow paths. See, for example, Applicants' specification at page 10, lines 3-23 in which separately collected particles are clearly along different flow paths. Also, the independent flow paths are clearly seen, for example, in Figs. 3, 4, 7, 10 and 15. Claim 38 has been amended to incorporate features from claim 56. No new matter is introduced by the amendments.

Claims 64-68 have been allowed. Claims 8, 9, 11, 45-52, 55 and 62 are free of the cited art.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the clear explanation in the Advisory Action of his views on the remaining rejections.

Rejection Over Marsh et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 38, 53, 54, 56-60 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,649,037 to Marsh et al. (the Marsh patent). Applicants incorporate by reference the discussion in the Amendment After Final of May 9, 2003. Applicants' have amended claim 38 for clarity in view of the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action. Applicants' maintain that the Marsh patent does not prima facie render Applicants' invention obvious.

With respect to claim 38 and claims depending from claim 38, the Examiner noted in the Advisory Action that claim 38 was broad. Claim 38 has been amended to more particularly point out Applicants' invention. With respect to the Marsh patent, the Examiner's

comment that Applicants' claims are directed to compositions and not powders is noted. Applicants' apologize for any confusion caused by imprecise phraseology. However, Applicants maintain that the Marsh patent does not teach or suggest the mixing of independent reaction products. The Examiner is correct that the Marsh patent discloses the mixing of an organic solvent, a hydrolyzable metal compound, water and optionally a surfactant. But this is all incorporated into a **single** admixture. The admixture is then reacted in a heating zone See, for example, column 2, lines 52-57. A **single** admixture forms a **single** reaction product composition. With all due respect, the Marsh patent does not teach or suggest forming **different** reaction products sequentially in time and collecting them together in a single collector. Since the Marsh patent does not disclose features of Applicants' claimed, the Marsh patent does not render claim 38 prima facie obvious.

With respect to claim 58 and claims depending from claim 58, the Marsh patent does not teach or suggest a reactor with different reactant sources. As noted by the Examiner, the Marsh patent teaches the formation of a reaction admixture. This reaction admixture sprayed into a heating zone. While the Marsh patent teaches a mixture of reactants, the Marsh patent does not teach a plurality of reaction admixtures within their apparatus. Applicants' claims on the other hand are directed to a method performed with a reactant delivery system comprising a first quantity of reactants and a second quantity of reactants. The description in the preamble is directly referenced in the method steps such that they are clearly part of the invention. In particular, the first and second quantity of reactants are different from each other and reacted sequentially in time. The Marsh patent does not describe a reactant delivery system that can deliver two different quantities of fluid reactants for sequential reaction. Since the Marsh patent does not teach or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claimed invention, the Marsh patent does not render Applicants' claimed invention prima facie obvious.

Since the Marsh patent does not render Applicants' claimed invention prima facie obvious, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 38, 53, 54, 56-60 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Marsh patent.

Rejections Over Marsh et al. and Acosta et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10, 12-14, 39-44 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Marsh patent as applied to claims 38, 53, 54, 56 and 57 and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,254,826 to Acosta et al. (the Acosta patent). Applicants incorporate by reference the discussion in the Amendment After Final of May 9, 2003. Applicants have amended claim 1 for clarity. Applicants' maintain that the Marsh patent does not prima facie render Applicants' invention obvious.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner indicated that the previous claim language did not indicate the relationships described in Applicants' remarks in the Amendment of May 9, 2003. However, there seems to be some remaining misunderstanding with respect to the particular relationships of the collectors. As noted by the Examiner, Applicants' specification describes a plurality of ways of collecting the reaction products. However, the description at page 10, first full paragraph does not describe collectors in series. The description described **parallel** collectors used to collect product sequentially or simultaneously, with respect their to **temporal** relationship. Applicants have hopefully clarified that the collectors of claim 1 are necessarily in parallel. Since the Marsh patent does not teach or suggest parallel collectors, the Marsh patent does not render prima facie obvious claim 1 or any claims depending from claim 1.

With respect to claim 61, Applicants have noted the deficiencies of the Marsh patent with respect teaching the features of claim 58, from which claim 61 depends. As with the Marsh patent, the Acosta patent does not disclose a reactant delivery system as claimed by Applicants. This was discussed further in the Amendment of May 9, 2003. Thus, the Acosta

patent does not make up for the deficiencies of the Marsh patent. Since the references combined or separately do not teach or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claimed invention, the combined disclosures of the Marsh patent and the Acosta patent do not render claim 61 prima facie obvious.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 10, 12-14, 39-44 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Marsh patent as applied to claims 38, 53, 54, 56 and 57 and further in view of the Acosta patent.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter S. Dardi

Peter S. Dardi, Ph.D.
Registration No. 39,650

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuente, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5746